

University of Michigan Law School

University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports

University of Michigan Law School Alumni
Survey Project

Class of 1966 Fifteen Year Report Alumni Comments

University of Michigan Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.law.umich.edu/alumni_survey_reports



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "Class of 1966 Fifteen Year Report Alumni Comments" (1981).

This Response or Comment is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Michigan Law School Alumni Survey Project at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

Responses from the Members of
The Class of 1966
To the Last Question on Survey Asking For
"Comments of Any Sort About Your Life
or Law School or Whatever"

Class of 1966 - Comments

I'm not extremely enthusiastic about the reliability of projecting conclusions and opinions based on these types of multiple choice questionnaires. I hope this project helps in planning the law school curriculum.

I found law school to be nearly as boring as Holmes Sr. predicted ("for people who like to eat their sawdust without butter.") I persevered so that my parents wouldn't think I was feckless, and because I thought practice would be more interesting. Partly right on both counts. I don't regret law school, and consider that UM did an excellent job at what it was attempting to do (as I perceive it (a) to teach people to think like lawyers, (b) to give them a reasonable working knowledge of substantive law and procedure and (c) to create a disposition towards ethical practice.

In general I have not found the law to be intellectually stimulating (my own deficiencies, I am sure) or particularly challenging (my career channel, perhaps). I think the importance of legal services is vastly over-rated, not only in terms of the fees charged; and I have substantial reservations about the "cult of adversary procedure" fostered by the law schools (not specifically UM). My observation is that lawyers, almost as often as not, and mostly because of their professional commitment to adversary procedure rather than venal intent, contribute more to the problem than the solution. (Or at least we twist the problem out of its natural contours into a form we are trained to handle.) I believe the law schools ought to consider, and teach law students to consider, whether

1. Non-adversarial procedures might be better suited to resolution of a particular class of problems, e.g. domestic relations

2. Use of adversarial procedures in a "symbolic mode" (i.e., with each party affecting to symbolize or represent some broader interest) is a fair or desirable way of setting public priorities.

Like many students in the 60's I started law school with only the vaguest notion of what lawyers did all day. I gather that much more has been done with "technical," "clinical" and "practitioner" courses since then. I assume this is good*, but I wonder whether the student, the law school, the community and country might be well served by giving law school applicants a much clearer notion of what is involved in a real world legal career and then helping them decide whether they would willingly do that if the compensation and perks weren't out of all proportion to the social utility.

*actually I suspect it is bad--I would like to see the best law schools (UM especially) gradually outgrow the trade school orientation and teach law as a branch of ethical, cultural, historical science--in other words to teach justice and jurisprudence--not mere substance and technique.

More emphasis should be placed in the Law School curriculum on courses which are practice oriented. For instance, the majority of my practice is in the areas of real estate and business law. I believe I would have been better prepared for the practice of law had the Law School offered courses in real estate finance, the drafting of real estate instruments and business agreements of varying types, accounting and negotiation. In addition, greater emphasis should be placed on legal writing of all kinds. The greatest deficiency we find in prospective associates is in their writing ability.

Undoubtedly, the greatest lesson learned at Law School was methodology--how to recognize and analyze legal problems. However, greater balance between this discipline and the practical application thereof should be sought.

Young lawyers will lie or use deceit to get ahead. Little honor in agreements--e.g. to supply info without a formal order.

Stalling settlements because of docket crowding for econ advantage of ins. Co's or banks is too common.

On the whole my legal career has been satisfactory. I do find some dissatisfaction with the efficiency of the N.Y. State Court system.

Enjoy teaching 3 hours a week--"Real Estate Transactions" at one of the local law schools.

Enjoy "business decision" as much as legal work.

I enjoyed my years at U. of M. Law School very much. Looking back on the experience, one of the most valuable things was meeting and working with persons from other areas and social backgrounds. In addition, the law school helped me to reason and to discipline my thoughts and actions.

The practice of law continues to offer all the opportunities I imagined as a younger person--there is still a place for conscience, ambition, change, etc.

Biggest problem is the growing numbers of young lawyers who have no sense of the higher traditions of the system and whose only contact with the law and lawyers is the scandal of Watergate and after.

This was very hard to fill out accurately.

U-M was and is a great law school.

My law school experience was not enjoyable. I could not accept the fact that top grades seemed beyond my grasp. I resented the Socratic method of teaching/learning until I taught in law school myself (many years later) and understood, for the first time, how interrogation serves to expand one's ability to analyze and focus on issues. I thank God that you taught me how to think!!

It took me many years to appreciate that the most important skill of an excellent lawyer is his ability to think, analyze and speak logically, not his ability to "memorize" substantive law.

Don't let the outcry for "practical" subjects deter you from teaching theory. I never forgot the theory I learned and the practical knowledge is learned "on the street." It need not be learned in law school.

I do believe that writing courses should be mandatory for many more semesters--most lawyers don't know how to write well and it's a critical skill.

I developed a great fondness for the Law School which I retain today. I sort of "drifted" into law school with no real career plans but have found the practice of law to be quite satisfying.

I am very proud to have graduated from University of Michigan Law School and, if given a choice to decide again, would not have chosen any other law school.

I have given up trying to convince U-M that it should train lawyers, not professors. I learned to be a lawyer after I left law school. I learned to examine everything critically and with a healthy skepticism after I left law school. In short, I got short-changed. Law is virtually the only profession in which clinical experience (extensive) is not a required pre-requisite (see, eg., teaching, nursing, medical, dental, etc., etc.). Not only are law schools in general, and U-M in particular, not moving toward more clinical experience, but all I read in your publications convinces me you are irrevocably opposed to the concept. Until your theory and emphasis change, you will receive no support from me.

Law School in retrospect was a highly technical experience--practicing law as a small town attorney is anything but that. You need more "down home" education about why people act the ways they do, what the strengths and limitations of the "system(s)" are, and situational ethics. It would have been really helpful to me if the law school had brought in a series of practicing attorneys and judges (etc.) to supplement the professors' teaching and to tell it the "way it is" as Howard Cosell says. F. Lee Bailey cooling it in the lounge with his velvet-lined 3 piece suit wasn't much help--looking back it would have been really helpful to talk with the Probate Judge from Gaylord, a GM lawyer from Detroit, the city attorney from Flint, a legislator, an attorney from Marquette, etc., etc.--maybe over a few beers!!!

I think that the law school should provide the opportunity for a semester practice internship.

Secondly, a seminar in goal setting on a motivational level would have helped me to understand how these personal goals integrate with the reality of the lawyer's function in the society he must live and function in.

I felt less than adequately prepared for private practice in Michigan after graduation. Procedure courses were not adequate at that time or not enough time from required courses was allowed to take these courses. I would think that students would greatly benefit from an internship (for credit) in law offices to see the dynamics of a law office. The danger in this type of situation is the first impressions gained from lawyers who are ethically questionable, sloppy in their work habits or work product.

I applaud your efforts in this type of survey.

The first year of law school was worth all the rest of my education put together.

Michigan Law School is the greatest!!

I believe that Law School is a trade school and that universities such as Cornell where I did my undergraduate work are for intellectual pursuits. When I attended U of M, the philosophy was that Law School was an intellectual exercise. Had it been a 2 year trade school it would have been much better for my purposes. I would suggest that the Toledo Barber School would be a good example to follow. Instead of considering itself the "Harvard of the Mid-West" it should consider itself the Toledo Barber School of Michigan.

Law school must become more practical. Clinics and research techniques must be refined and expanded in each year of law school. Too much time was spent on Socratic method--law can be taught from hornbook for substance and then spend time on its application through actual experience or hypotheticals. The creation of a pressure filled atmosphere by artificial means--professor harassment--is not helpful to the learning process for substantive law or to prepare one to handle pressures of practice, including the court room.

I'm very pleased to be a lawyer. Law school did not prepare me particularly well for the work I'm doing which is dealing with individual dynamics. I have learned counseling & negotiating skills since law school. Some formal training would have been useful--altho I'm not sure I would have even taken a course in counseling or psychiatry in law school.

Have loved practicing law for 15 years in private practice with 3 different firms--every minute of it. Now love my new job of not practicing law per se but using my experience, MBA, law degree and talents in helping to manage a business. Hope to have at least one and preferably 2 more unrelated careers before I give up the ghost.

My career is very interesting, and fun to me. My partners are stimulating; indeed, they are on the whole a marvelously talented group; our associates too (including several now from U-M) are a very strong group.

I did not enjoy Law School.
I enjoy the practice.
I almost dropped out of Law School because I assumed the practice would be similar to my law school experience.
An effort should be made to communicate to the student what the practice of law involves.
Because I did not clerk, part of the problem was mine.

Law school reflected the overwhelming power of those forces who employ lawyers--corporations and corporate law firms. As such the entire curriculum was biased against the majority of day to day litigants. Quantitatively, the overwhelming majority of litigants in this country (1 person (corporation) 1 law suit, so to speak) consists of injured people, working people, and poor people. Whether it is workers' compensation, unemployment compensation, social security, divorce, debtors practice or criminal law, this practice involves the individual person seeking justice from an institution. Even though this practice involves thousands of people (perhaps millions) and employs 1000's of lawyers, it is treated as a subordinate, almost irrelevant, part of law school.

Law is made, applied, generated by trial lawyers; yet trial practice is a nonentity in law school. Given the complete dominance of the corporate point of view in our law schools, I'm reluctant to recommend that they teach personal injury, workers' compensation or even trial practice. The biased approach would do more harm than good. Given that fact, we still must start somewhere; therefore, I request, at least, recognition of the problem.

Since law school, I have been lucky enough to enter a practice that I find emotionally and intellectually satisfying. That occurred in spite of, not because of, my formal law school experience.

I thought life with a corporate employer would be more stable--but then my corporation was acquired, and the acquiring corporation was itself acquired, and my job was eliminated, at the location where I was (& where I perceive the client to be). So now I work for a law firm.

A strong backhand approach shot would go a long way toward compensating for any minor dissatisfactions the foregoing might evince.

We are turning out too many lawyers, in response to a society which: 1) demands access to the legal system as a privilege; and 2) tends to litigate every disagreement and grievance. A result is the bringing of a great deal of spurious litigation, as a function of the failure of newer attorneys to exercise the discretion (once known) they might in selecting business, having less and less (per capita advocate) among which to select, and a less appealing potential from which to do so (older, established lawyers retaining most), and being self-employed as many more beginners now are.

In addition to this overcrowding our courts, effectively denying justice to those truly (read: traditionally) entitled, this burgeoning of law business has also expanded our bar associations, and their governance, beyond bounds controllable by private volunteer service by member attorneys.

Throughout my career I am repeatedly reminded of what an excellent education I received at the University of Michigan Law School. I am concerned by the faculty drain to the Sun Belt states and think salaries should be increased to meet competition from these schools. To the extent that the quality of Michigan's education decreases, my prestige and status as a U of M graduate decreases, even if the University was great at the time I attended it. This loss of prestige and status will only cause me to reduce financial support. Keep professors' salaries competitive.

Marijuana should be legal.

Voluntary prayer is not voluntary to those not desiring to participate.

Government should not be concerned with abortion; only individuals.

Racial/ethnic background is irrelevant and counting only perpetuates discrimination.

All National Politicians should be voted out of office.

The President should serve for only one 6-year term. (And probably senators too!)

And if Britain and Argentina want to fight, let them. Don't choose sides.

If I have any substantial complaint about law schools and the law profession it is that there is insufficient integration of the end of "law" as (1) a way to make a living, (2) a route to a satisfying intellectual life, (3) a route to improve upon the foundations and hence, the incidents of civilized life in the U.S.A. By this I mean that courts, legislatures and law schools (which ought to be crucibles for testing the wisdom of conflicting impulses) tend to permit and suffer all manner of screwball theories of causes of action, rights of recovery against others and departures from proper practice (denominated and dismissed as 'harmless error'). This will sound to the reader as though I am a hard-core conservative but that is not the case. I believe in most (but not all) "liberal" causes, but I deplore the lack of attention to the rule of law, in the trial of lawsuits, that characterizes our practice the last 15 years. Fidelity to law is most lacking where it ought to be paramount, i.e.-in the trial courts of our State and U.S. District courts. I believe we have sacrificed too much in the name of ego-trips for lawyers with bizarre theories. The result: "hyperlexis"--(See N.Y.L. Rev.). The law schools do not discourage the filing of groundless suits.

Fond memories of intellectual stimulation in an outstanding academic environment blessed by outstanding faculty and an exceptional student body--that's the good news!

The bad news is the terror that used to strike me as I contemplated such spiritually crippling experiences as the UCC exam!

All in all I owe a great debt of gratitude to the U of M Law School, to the many fond memories and great associations I carried away from Ann Arbor.

In my next life I wish to return as "Jerry" Israel's Marine Corps D.I.! Semper Fi!

I have not found the practice of law particularly rewarding. The exception for me was a five-year stint as a prosecutor at the trial and appellate levels which I found most rewarding.

It seems to me that in civil litigation, concepts of fairness and justice are not particularly relevant as far as an attorney is concerned. Clients want to win. They care little about anything else. This is certainly true in commercial litigation where the only question is dollars and cents. It seems to me that the practice of law is essentially a business, not a profession, and too often those who are willing to be unethical are the attorneys who thrive. Even the best are willing to cut corners, if necessary, to obtain a large fee or to satisfy an important client. The delays are often unbelievably long, sometimes intentionally, at other times due to the system itself. Legal fees are high and, due to the American rule, even those parties who are clearly in the right often end up paying substantial sums of money in attorneys' fees. Perhaps that is the price that must be paid for a system of law which must attempt to resolve disputes in a peaceful way, but it seems to me that there should be less litigation and that the litigation which is legitimate should be less costly and shorter in duration.

All in all, I am quite content with my life on all fronts.

More effort could have been made by the faculty to have contact with law students. More effort could have been made to provide information concerning what the profession of law is all about and the career opportunities available.

Law School is not nearly practical enough in its approach to substantive law subjects. This narrowness of approach greatly limits the utility of the legal education. I was shocked to discover a much more relevant and significantly different thought process and approach to all legal & business problems upon my attendance at the Harvard Business School after graduation from law school. This expanded thought process makes the average lawyer appear to be operating on an extremely narrow track to the outside world with almost no creativity or ability to relate the law to the problems of the real world.

I think that Michigan Law School gave me the necessary training to analyze problems and seek solutions to those problems. I don't think a law school can be expected to train law students in the day to day problems of dealing with other lawyers, senior partners, or clients who want immediate solutions to sometimes unsolvable problems.

I think the basic program of the Law School is very sound and I would not really recommend any significant changes.

I enjoyed filling out this questionnaire and am interested in the results.

The ability to analyze/recognize issues is the most significant contribution of course work, not the matter or subject being taught.

Most of client counselling is done by letter/telephone.

.....I don't rate "social change" very highly as a goal. Working in the home/church/community to revitalize traditional values on the other hand rates highly.

Confiscatory tax laws destroy any financial satisfaction in our profession, substantially reduce take home pay of employees(both directly & indirectly), undercut support for the arts and worthwhile community projects, and our ability in the local community to take care of our own problems.

1) Feel very strongly that contingency fee arrangements should be barred--with requirement for pro bono or other programs, needy can be taken care of adequately.

2) Enactment of legislation which would prevent long delays in both civil & criminal cases.

3) Enactment of legislation which would require judges at all levels to pass competency exams.

4) Provide better career counseling to 3rd year law students.

The most serious problem faced by lawyers and judges is lack of competence. Unfortunately continuing legal education and certification of specialties have not proved adequate. Bar exams are essentially irrelevant to this issue. Somehow the bar, judiciary and educational institutions must effectively address this problem.

Another serious problem, which contributes to the adverse effects of incompetent representation, is the lack of informed consumers of legal services. Unless the consumer is able to evaluate both credentials and performance and thereby obtain competent representation, lawyers will continue to be suspect in the eyes of the community.

A third problem is the adoption, administration and enforcement of a viable code of professional responsibility. Such a code must have clearly determinable standards and fair and uniform administration and enforcement.

Good questionnaire! The percentage questions are tough and answers only estimates.

From what I hear you are still turning out good attorneys.

I would require all law students to sit on a civil jury at least once.

I would also require some form of group counselling for all students prior to graduation as well as a course given by someone from the Medical School on group dynamics and individual psychological types, etc. Lawyers are people who are seen very often when people are anxious or stressed; lawyers need to know how to help the client in this area also. I would also give an intensive course in negotiations techniques, labor as well as other.

Preparing the questionnaire was difficult in that I am not in private practice but work for the IRS as a tax trial attorney. Consequently I have one client, so to speak, and do not have problems with (1) obtaining work, (2) billing, (3) fee arrangement, or (4) collecting fees.

To my knowledge I have never had problems with "outside" counsel lying to me or intentionally misrepresenting facts. Of course the opposition may not "tell all," but when specifically asked, answers are truthful and for the most part complete.

I became dissatisfied by the "public" opinion of Government employees in general, and the IRS in particular. This is particularly so in the last three to six year.

I appreciate and am thankful for the educational opportunity provided me by The University of Michigan Law School. I am always proud to say that I am a U-M law school grad.

I abhor the trend toward group rights (primarily race) and away from individual merit selection with regard to school admissions, employment opportunities, etc.

I find the Federal income tax laws extremely frustrating. I am essentially from the "old school" of hard work, savings, and caring for one's own family. I don't like fancy gimics and investments and I don't like planning my life based upon the tax laws. A person who adheres to these simple, old-fashioned virtues gets beat to death by the tax laws and one often wonders what sense it makes to undergo the pressures of a full time trial practice when you're only a 50% partner in the venture.

I loved the U-M/Ann Arbor experience, and am a proud alumnus. I think that whatever failures that I have encountered in the world of law are the result of personal habits and cannot be attributed to the education that was offered me at Michigan. In short, I don't have any significant suggestions for change at the school.

I have come to appreciate those aspects of law school that demanded uncompromising excellence. That is what counts in private practice and most business.

My life has been great--many more ups than downs. I am pleased I chose law as a career--it has been very satisfying. As to the "whatevers"--I enjoy fishing and I truly believe that the time spent fishing is not deducted from one normal lifespan.

I am very satisfied with the legal education I received at the U. of M. Law School. I learned how to identify and analyze problems as a lawyer should. Providing such skills should still be the basic function of a legal education, and the approach used by the Law School when I attended should continue to dominate the curriculum. In addition, the first year, required courses, as well as Constitutional law and civil procedure, are fundamental and should continue to be required. Nevertheless, I believe that the range of offerings when I attended law school (1963-66) was too limited, both with respect to substance and the clinical offerings. Also the writing course, which should be an important required course, was poor; few if any students a year or 2 out of law school can teach such courses, and the approach of one big project did not make sense. In short I did not learn enough in that course. Finally, I think legal education should give more attention to teaching how statutes, and therefore other codified law, should be construed. Obviously the case method of analysis is pertinent to statutory construction, but all too often in practice I have seen lawyers frame arguments based solely on cases, and in total disregard of governing statutes.

Michigan was a fine school, but while I was there I received no financial support from the school while minorities less qualified than myself did receive financial aid. For this reason I will never contribute financial support to the school.

I enjoyed U of M Law School--especially the intellectual challenge & its assistance in development of a logical thought process. As a practicing attorney--CPA, I strongly favor additions of courses designed with a combination of law & accounting (i.e., accounting for business combinations, etc.). I have found that many attorneys do not understand the accounting/tax effects of legal documents and, thus, do not provide clients with adequate information regarding transactions. I also strongly favor legal specialization.

1) Michigan prepared me as well as possible in the science of law. I was fortunate enough to apprentice myself to a firm that was able to impart something of the art and practice of law. The toughest part has been the last ten years as a solo trial lawyer learning the business of law. From what I gather in conversation with my brothers at the bar, this is a common problem. No way to learn it, really well except by trial and error.

2) The quality and depth which are the hallmark of the Michigan law grad become evident very soon after graduation & last forever.

3) "Practical" courses are almost impossible to fashion and difficult to teach, but the trial bar really needs some kind of internship, apprenticeship or whatever to upgrade the quality of tomorrow's litigators. Anyone else have any ideas??

There seems to be an increasing gulf between the ivory tower law school and the professional skills of the practicing bar. This is exacerbated by the continual hiring by law schools of professors who disdain the practice of law.

Certainly law schools should teach the intellectual and philosophical aspects of our legal system and the policy foundations of our laws, but they must show how those matters relate to the routine of helping real people solve their problems. There is scant if any attention paid (in Law School) to lawyering skills. Witness the disfavor in which basic property, trusts and estates, and similar courses are held by the Michigan faculty, and the emphasis put on constitutional law and other courses, none of which are ever practiced in the real world.

This is a plea for a more balanced approach, not a cry for practice oriented courses. The how to do it should and can remain pretty much outside the regular curriculum.

I am executive vice president of an investment counseling firm and found most of the questions inapplicable.

This questionnaire was not suited to my situation. I run two diverse businesses & practice what I call urban law as a major part of my more active business. As an urban lawyer I engage in activities not traditionally thought of as lawyering. These activities and the more common legal matters I deal with all constitute an approach to social & urban problem solving that is very much the lawyer's responsibility.

My major criticism of law school was the failure of the institution & nearly all professors to put specific legal courses into the larger contexts of legal history, overall legal concepts, and law & society. Much of my learning was much too isolated from these larger issues. I was legitimately angry when I studied for the bar exam & in later studies to discover this larger context and to think of the excitement we were denied in law school of exploring it in greater depth.

More attention needs to be given to preparing students for the requirements of the Bar examinations. The subject of Bar examinations was rarely mentioned. The assumption seems to be that if a student was able to pass the courses and meet the requirements for a degree from the U. of Mich. Law School, he was prepared for the Bar exam. However, I believe that the requirements for a passing score on the Bar exam were significantly more demanding than the requirements for a passing grade in courses at the Law School. If I knew something about the subject matter, made a general analysis of the problem presented, and wrote a lot, I received a passing grade in law school courses. Therefore, I felt that I was prepared to meet the requirements of the Bar examination. To my dismay, I found out that my legal education and approach to problem solving, which had been adequate for law school, were not sufficient for the Bar exam.

This questionnaire is interesting but I cannot help but wonder whether or not its preparation included input from some in the categories to which it is directed. It also appears that a heavy emphasis is placed on questions for litigators. I would guess that most of my colleagues to whom this is directed are not primarily so engaged. The questions indicate little attention to the concerns of a lawyer primarily engaged in a corporate or commercial practice.

The day I finished law school I did not feel like a lawyer. The training in school seemed so divorced from reality. Much of law school would have been more effectively presented if it had been in the form of self-paced programmed learning.

One course that I took as an undergraduate which I always regarded as silly was sociology. This was for the reason that it was short on substance yet heavy on terminology for the purpose of somehow justifying its existence. It appeared as though the law school employed a sociologist to prepare this survey. Only a second letter & my loyalty to the U of M law school motivated me to answer this 'silly' survey.

Most frightening professor	- Israel, Palmer
" brilliant	" - Harris
" humorous	" - Harris, Julin
" articulate	" - St. Antoine
" likeable	" - Bishop
" self-centered	" - Kamisar
" callous & insensitive	- Kamisar
Best professor	- Paul Kauper
Worst professor	- Proffit - but nice guy
Most boring	- Cooperrider

I feel better!

Suggestion: every Law School graduate who has any interest in practicing law in a small firm or individually should give it a try immediately after graduation for a minimum of five years. The temptation of a large law firm, government or corporation should not be permitted to interfere with the suggested career plan.

A comprehensive education in legal principles and reasoning--that is, the substance of the law--will best prepare the law student for the practice of law.

I enjoyed law school once I stopped taking it too seriously. I very much enjoyed the university environment. I received good academic training and equally poor practical training. This is principally due to the unwillingness or inability of most faculty members to practice law or teach practical aspects of the law (exceptions being Ted St. Antoine and hopefully others on the current faculty).

Michigan is too traditional; the use of seminars and interdisciplinary courses is a step in the right direction. Good practice skills--e.g., ideas orally during conference, argument; to persuade a trier of fact--are not antithetical to the academic approach. Continued reliance on the Socratic method is counterproductive.

I am proud to have gone to the Law School and would do so again on balance. I have my reservations but they also apply to the other national law schools of which I am familiar.

I appreciate my legal training. I do criticize the emphasis upon using instructors who have done well academically but have little practical experience. The faculty should include a few crusty & experienced practicing lawyers to temper the theory.

Somewhere in the 3 years the concept of creativity in legal argument & innovation in legal theory took root. I am grateful for that.

Are there any "inalienable" bases for legal theory any more? I am increasingly concerned that value (ultimate right or wrong) can not be separated from education of any type. Does the Law School teach ethical value from anything other than "It will hurt if you get caught" bases?

1. Being a graduate of the University of Michigan Law School and a Law Review Editor was a significant advantage when seeking employment.

2. I am still unhappy (after 15 years) at not receiving a scholarship for my second and third years. I met the requirement of Law Review editorship but was not considered to have had the requisite financial need. This, in effect, penalized me for having saved funds during my military career for the purpose of attending law school. Those who did not plan ahead were the beneficiaries.

I spent 2½ years in a large corporate firm, 9 months in solo practice, & 12 years in legal services, including 6 as director, & 5 months in city law dept. I've studied nutrition 11 years, I am working on a Ph.D. degree in it. My interest in nutrition arose from its apparent relation to the health, behavior & legal scrapes of my indigent clients. For 5 years I gave nutrition (& ecology counseling, including particularly avoidance or protection from chemicals at work, home; & artificial lighting conditions) counseling to legal clients whose legal problems involved serious behavioral or health conditions--custody, parental rights terminations, criminal cases, mental commitments, employment discharges, domestic violence, domestic relations--& found that the nutritional & ecologic measures were a far more effective solution to the underlying problems than the very expensive, wasteful, & ineffective legal or standard medical & psychological approaches. Then in 1981 I moved to Texas to devote more direct effort to this approach, including for a while a full time nutrition counseling practice, & now part time, while earning a living in law, & trying to set up funded programs to counsel probationers in criminal cases nutritionally. In legal work I enjoy major litigation the most, because it's competitive & invokes so many different fields, & for its constructive potential. Having a variety of interests & the constructive potential of law are two things that attracted me to law in the first place.

The University of Michigan Law School appeared to me to be a highly depersonalized institution with a remote, aloof faculty. I believe that three years of case method is too much although it was useful the first year or so. The school seemed geared toward producing lawyers to represent large corporations.

Contrary to my expectations, I found the law school environment very supportive--faculty, fellow students and administrative staff--and remarkably unbureaucratic. In recent years I have worked with a number of law students from other law schools. As a result of what I have learned from them, I am convinced that the U of M Law School experience is very unusual. I certainly hope that the tradition of treating law students decently continues even after the Roy Proffitts have retired.

Far more important to my education than the subject matter of particular courses was the quality of the institution. For example, I cannot recall any of the tax rules L. Hart Wright taught in tax, but I use what I learned about interpreting legislation and other legal documents and analyzing problems everyday.

1. The New library design is good.

2. U-M Law School scholarships should not be based on selection for the Law Review, especially since that gives students the final say in the eligibility of other students for scholarships from the Law School.

The University of Michigan is the finest institution for higher education in the world. It has made such a difference to my family.

I'm primarily a Bankruptcy Lawyer/Trustee.

Re Question C.9.--The most satisfying thing is being able to accomplish what you set out to do--help a client, save a business, redress a wrong, etc., whether it be done in court or out, and whether it is contested or not.

Re Question C.17.a.--The reason for my answer is that all the really good (except me) bankruptcy lawyers are Jewish. I sometimes feel I'd get more clients if I wasn't perceived (fairly) as a WASP. Contratulations on a good, thorough, survey!

This is a rather superficial questionnaire. Most of the questions are open to several interpretations and many belie reality. I think you have to reexamine what it is you would like to know about U of M alumni and recast the questionnaire. If you reexamine the questionnaire you will find some biases, a priori assumptions and a narrow view of legal practice, law school education and of life.

Speaking as one who has left a larger law firm and started up a small law firm (and incidentally these observations would be the same had I not left the 60+ person firm), the questionnaire does not elicit information that is meaningful. At 15 years out of law school one is working incredibly hard; one is tired; one worries whether clients will exist tomorrow and whether one will represent them if they do; one is trying to be the best one can be; one is trying to keep up with the developments in the law; one is trying to make a contribution to the community, state, or nation; one is trying to have a reasonable home life; one is trying to be a loving and stimulating parent; and one is trying to be a supportive and loving spouse--and the questionnaire asks questions which are antiseptic and cannot possibly give you meaningful information, or at least information you can act upon.

(cont'd)

I think you should be asking questions not out of idle curiosity but to elicit answers which might help the Law School today. You could ask questions that might help you reexamine the standards used for admission or scholarship aid. You could ask questions which could permit you to compare subsequent performance with law school performance. You could ask questions to elicit information concerning the personal and professional qualities necessary for success to compare them to admission standards and curriculum. The questionnaire does not seem amenable to the above uses. Otherwise, there is not much point to your survey. The answers may be nice to know, but of what significance are they? Enough! You now have had more than 30 minutes.

I am not now, nor have been for a long time, engaged in any kind of legal occupation and my answers must therefore be limited and seen as those of an outsider. However, at your suggestion, I am returning this questionnaire for whatever it is worth to your statistical survey.

Legal career in New York dominated my life for 11 years. Married late (age 39) probably as a result. Currently living in Washington active in govt. service.

My answers relative to U of M must be understood in context. After I left law school I entered the business world (non-legal aspects) with no intention of practicing. I also spent 3½ years as a Naval officer. I entered private practice of law after 5 years of having not given the law a moment's thought.

Although I am not functioning directly as a lawyer in my current work as director of a rural community development program in Latin America, I nevertheless find useful the skills & habits I learned in law school, including insight into the structures of government & business & habits of analytical thinking that help to see more than one side of a question. I regret that in law school I was never challenged to question these structures of government & business. We analyzed cases to see who could win, not who should win--and we were not asked to consider the law we studied in terms of its impact on the national & international society in which we lived, although I was studying law during years of great social upheaval and unrest. Although I was among the students that initially pressed for establishment of a student legal aid program, I recall the almost uniform disinterest of the faculty when the idea was first presented. It was not in law school but in theological seminary that I was confronted with the broad concepts of justice and injustice, of a society that "buys the poor for money and the needy for a pair of shoes." (Amos 8:4)

It would be interesting to see a survey on the availability of part time jobs for lawyers. This is an area of particular concern to my women law students, & some men are also interested in doing something other than practicing law on weekends. When I worked for the Denver District Attorney I worked 3/4ths time for 3/4ths pay, so that I could be home when my children came home from school. In the annual survey of Denver judges, asking judges to rank lawyers in the DA's office, I had the

(cont'd)

the highest rating of any lawyer in the office--indicating that a part-time lawyer could be highly effective. When she was beginning her legal practice Ann Gorsuch (EPA Administrator) shared a job with another woman attorney in order to spend time with her children. Even though I disagree strongly politically with Ann Gorsuch, she has proved herself to be a very capable lawyer. The opportunity to work part-time as a lawyer permitted Ann to contribute her abilities to the legal profession without sacrificing the needs of her children while they were young. But flexibility was required.

In recent years several of my top women students have taken jobs with smaller firms, despite offers from higher ranking firms, because of the greater flexibility with small firms.

(I should think that you might be interested in bar admissions, advanced degrees, etc. of non-practicing lawyers, such as judges and teachers--& how long they have practiced in the last 15 years.)

As you can see from this questionnaire, I perceived my experience at the U of M law school as invaluable in my chosen career. The single most important lesson was how to think. This was administered by challenging professors, and an intellectually stimulating student body. Over the past fifteen years I have worked with some of the finest legal talent in the country. Those that excell are those with great verbal skills and a unique ability to think on their feet. The law school could do much to further develop these skills by encouraging more exercise of **these** skills with a dose of creativity.

A relatively small number of graduates go into trial work, the majority practice in an atmosphere of negotiation. Much could be gained by a parallel emphasis on legal writing and verbal negotiations. In addition, law school courses that explain the way businesses operate and the legal ramifications would further assist the preparation of future practitioners.